UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,096	02/04/2002	Om Reddy Gaddam	U 013840-5	4298

7590 02/12/2003

LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

EXAMINER
MCKENZIE, THOMAS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	5

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/067,096	GADDAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas McKenzie Ph.D.	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 February 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-65* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12,14,16,18,20-24,26,28,30-36,38,40,42,44,46,48,50,52-58,60,62,64 and 65* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *11,13,15,17,19,25,27,29,37,39,41,43,45,47,49,51,59,61 and 63* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *3* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to an application filed on 2/4/02. There are sixty-five claims pending and sixty-five under consideration. Claims 1, 2, and 11 are compound claims. Claims 12-23 are composition claims. Claims 24-63 are use claims. Claims 3-10, 64, and 65 are synthesis claims. This is the first action on the merits. The application concerns some salts of phenoxazine and phenothiazine compounds, compositions, synthesis, and uses thereof.

Title

2. The title of the invention is too generic and is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: replacing the word "Tricyclic" by the phrase "Phenoxazine and Phenothiazine"

Specification

3. The specification needs to be amended. According to MPEP 201.11, when a non-provisional application is entitled to an earlier U.S. effective filing date of one or more provisional applications under 35 USC 119(e), a statement such as, "This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/------, filed ----." should appear as the first sentence of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 and 12-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention. In line 3, claim 1 and in line 2, claim 3, Applicants' have the limitations, "its derivatives, its analogs". The word "derivatives" is indefinite for we do not know which compounds are contemplated. A derivative is the result of a reaction upon an organic molecule. Since we do not know the reagents or the conditions of these reactions, there is no way of determining the structures of the claimed "derivatives". The phrase "its derivatives" is, in essence, a product by process claim. Yet Applicants have not described the intended processes sufficiently that we may understand the structures of the compounds they claim. Webster's New World Dictionary defines derivative as "a substance derived from ... another substance by chemical change", and "substitution of one or more elements or radicals for one or more constituents of the original substance" has occurred. All definitions implying that new chemical bonds have formed. Clearly, many of the "derivatives" obtained from compounds of formula (I), will themselves be covered by formula (I). The question is, what compounds falling outside the structural limitations of formula (I) are covered under the rubric of "derivatives"?

5. The International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, Chemistry and Human Health Division, Medicinal Chemistry Section, in the "GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN MEDICINAL CHEMISTRY", located at

http://www.chem.qmw.ac.uk/iupac/medchem/index.html defines the latter term, "[a]n analog is a drug whose structure is related to that of another drug but whose chemical and biological properties may be quite different." Related how structurally? Applicants do not indicate in the specification what structures they intend by analog. Applicants' formula (I) is drawn to six-membered rings containing nitrogen and oxygen as well as nitrogen and sulfur. Is a nitrogen and selenium compound an analog? How about seven-membered nitrogen and oxygen compounds? The Examiner suggests deleting the phrase.

6. Claims 30-35 and 52-55 recites the limitation "dementia", "cancer", and "inflammation" in lines 7 and 9. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in parent claim 24, which recites "diseases in which insulin resistance is the underlying pathophysiological mechanism". Applicants have not asserted and it is not art recognized that the three rejected diseases are so mechanistically related.

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 20-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compositions for treating the other listed diseases, does not reasonably provide enablement for compositions for treating

cancer generally. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 30-35 and 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating other listed diseases, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating dementia, cancer generally, or inflammation generally. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer was not found sufficient to establish the enablement of claims directed to a method of treating seven types of cancer with members of a class of several compounds *In re Buting* 163 USPQ 689.

To make clearer the lack of enablement for treatment of all cancer, extrinsic evidence is supplied by Draetta (Ann. Reports Med. Chem.), final sentence on page 246 "Although many still think about the need for a magic bullet as a cure for all cancers, our knowledge of the molecular mechanism underlying this disease make the prospect of developing such a universal cure very unlikely." Since no universal cure for cancer has been developed, it follows that there is no correlation

between the assays relied upon by applicants and the ability to treat all cancers. Thus, those assays are not sufficient to enable such claims.

The remarkable advances in chemotherapy have seen the development of specific compounds to treat specific types of cancer. The great diversity of diseases falling within the "tumor" category means that it is contrary to medical understanding that any agent (let alone a genus of thousands of compounds) could be generally effective against such diseases. The intractability of these disorders is clear evidence that the skill level in this art is low relative to the difficulty of the task.

The scope of "dementia" (Alzheimer's disease) cannot be deemed enabled. There is no cure for the different types of Alzheimer's diseases and none have been treated with such $PPAR_{\gamma}$ receptor binders as are disclosed here. In volume 35 of "Annual Reports in Medicinal Chemistry" dated 2000 possible therapeutic applications of $PPAR_{\gamma}$ receptor agonists is discussed. On page 215, first complete paragraph biological effects are discussed and no neurodegenerative diseases are mentioned. In volume 33 of "Annual Reports in Medicinal Chemistry" dated 1998, on page 216, second paragraph the location of the $PPAR_{\gamma}$ receptor is disclosed as adipose tissue, the gut, liver, and kidney. Why do Applicants believe

that activation of a receptor not occurring in the brain will be effective for treatment of a CNS disease?

The intractability of neurodegenerative diseases is clear evidence that the skill level in this art is low relative to the difficulty of the task and not sufficient to enable treatment with inhibitors of this sort. Further, what little success there has been does not point in this direction. Thus, what very few treatments that the massive research effort on Alzheimer's diseases has produced are means of providing acetylcholinesterase inhibition, unrelated to the mechanism of action in this case.

Enablement for the scope of "inflammation" generally is not present. For a compound or genus to be effective against inflammation generally is contrary to medical science. Inflammation is a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There is no common mechanism by which all, or even most, inflammations arise. Mediators include bradykinin, serotonin, C3a, C5a, histamine, leukotrienes, cytokines, and many, many others. Accordingly, treatments for inflammation are normally tailored to the particular type of inflammation present, as there is no, and there can be no "magic bullet" against inflammation generally.

While Nuss (Ann. Reports Med. Chem.) offers speculation concerning cellular inflammation, noevidence is offered that any $PPAR_\gamma$ receptor agonist or any compound structurally related to Applicants has shown clinical efficacy against every inflammation. Willson (J. Med. Chem.) in the last paragraph on the left side of page 524 states that as of 2000, it was not known if "PPAR agonists have therapeutic utility beyond the metabolic disorders of diabetes and cardiovascular disease."

"The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims." *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. Determining if any of Applicants' compounds was capable of treating a specific human disease would clinical trials, a large amount and potentially inconclusive experimentation. The direction concerning clinical usage of Applicants compounds is found in paragraph [000113] on page 21. There are no working examples concerning the clinical efficacy of any of Applicants' compounds. The state of the art is summarized above. The artisan using

Applicants invention would be a physician with a MD degree and several years of clinical experience. The clinical and biological arts are inherently unpredictable, *In re Fisher* 166 USPQ 18, *In re Wright* 27 USPQ2d 1510, *In re Vaeck* 20 USPQ2d 1438.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in-
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).
>
> (f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 12, 16, 20, 24, 26, 30, 36, 38, 42, 44, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lohray ('453). The compound found in Example 12, lines 1-34, column 32 of the reference fits formula (I) with X = oxygen, $R^1 = R^2$ = hydrogen, n = 3, R^3 = the lower alkyl group hexyl, and M = sodium ion. See also Examples 14, 19, claim 1, and claim 9. Compositions are taught in the passage spanning line 55, column 21 to line 34, column 22. See also

claims 19, 20, and 22-27. Therapeutic uses are taught in lines 35-54, column 21. See also claims 21, and 28-42. Methanol solvent is taught in the process of making in line 21, column 32.

9. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 12, 16, 20, 24, 26, 30, 36, 38, 42, 44, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lohray (WO 99/19313 A1). The compound found in Example 12, lines 16-25, page 43 of the reference fits formula (I) with X = oxygen, $R^1 = R^2$ = hydrogen, n = 3, R^3 = the lower alkyl group hexyl, and M = sodium ion. See also Examples 14, 19, claim 1, claim 7, and claim 9. Compositions are taught in the passage spanning line 31, page 30 to line 20, page 31. See also claims 18 and 19. Therapeutic uses are taught in lines 4-13, page 31. See also claims 15-18. The salt forming process is taught in lines 22-28, page 29. Methanol solvent is taught in the process of making in line 2o, page 43.

10. Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lohray ('961). The compounds found in Examples 24-29 and 31-33, lines 30, column 49 through line 37, column 55 of the reference fits formula (I) with X = oxygen or sulfur, $R^1 = R^2$ = hydrogen, n = 3, R^3 = the lower alkyl group ethyl, and M = potassium, magnesium, arginine, lysine, and sodium. Claim 9 lists lithium ion as a choice among twelve possible salts. Thus, claims 2, 4-6,

and 8-10 are also anticipated, *In re Petering* 133 USPQ 275, *In re Schaumann* 197 USPQ 5, *Ex parte Broadbent* 150 USPQ 468. See also claims 1, 7-9, and 13. Compositions are taught in the passage spanning line 34, column 33 to line 8, column 34. See also claims 21-38. Therapeutic uses are taught in line 55, column 32 through line 34, column 33. See also claims 40-78. Claims 22 and 26 of the reference teach compositions containing a second active ingredient. Claims 44-47, 54-57, 64- 67, and 74-77 of the reference teaches treating diseases including syndrome X using this second active ingredient. Thus, claims 14, 18, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, and 62 are also anticipated.

11. Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lohray (WO 00/50414 A1). The compounds found in Examples 24-29 and 31-33, lines 21, page 58 through line 12, page 64 of the reference fits formula (I) with X = oxygen or sulfur, $R^1 = R^2$ = hydrogen, n = 3, R^3 = the lower alkyl group ethyl, and M = potassium, magnesium, arginine, lysine, and sodium. Claim 8 lists lithium ion as a choice among twelve possible salts. Thus, claims 2, 4-6, and 8-10 are also anticipated, *In re Petering* 133 USPQ 275, *In re Schaumann* 197 USPQ 5, *Ex parte Broadbent* 150 USPQ 468. See also claims 1, 4, 7, and 10. Compositions are taught in the passage spanning line 14,

page 40 to line 2, page 41. See also claims 11 and 13. Therapeutic uses are taught in line 55, column 32 through line 34, column 33. See also claims 15-19. Claims 12, 13, 43, and 44 of the reference teach compositions containing a second active ingredient. Claims 19-24 and 46-of the reference teaches treating diseases including syndrome X using this second active ingredient. Thus, claims 14, 18, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, and 62 are also anticipated.

12. Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. Although both Lohray ('453) and Lohray ('961) may be commonly assigned, neither shares an inventor with the present application yet claims the same subject matter.

Double Patenting

13. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969). A

timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b). Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 12, 16, 20, 24, 26, 30, 42, and 44 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12, 17, and 18-42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,054,453. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for reasons discussed above.

14. Claims 1, 12, 16, 20, 24, 26, 30, 42, and 44 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-12, 17, and 18-42 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,054,453 for reasons cited above. The present Application, according to the application transmittal is assigned to "Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Ltd." U.S. Patent No. 6,054,453 is assigned to "Dr Redd's Research Foundation".

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,054,453,

discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee is required under 37 CFR 1.78(c) and 35 U.S.C. 132 to either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made or to name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

15. Claims 1, 2, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, and 62 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14, 19, 21-67, and 69-77 of U.S. Patent No. 6,440,961. Although the conflicting

claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for reasons discussed above.

16. Claims 1, 2, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, and 62 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-14, 19, 21-67, and 69-77 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,440,961 for reasons cited above. The present Application, according to the application transmittal is assigned to "Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Ltd." U.S. Patent No. 6,440,961 is assigned to "Dr Reddy's Research Foundation".

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,440,961, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee is required under 37 CFR 1.78(c) and 35 U.S.C. 132 to either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made or to name the prior inventor of the

conflicting subject matter. Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

17. Claims 1, 12, 16, 20, 24, 26, 30, 32, 36, 38, 42, and 44 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/007,109. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Application No. 10/007,109 also claims salts of phenoxazine and phenothiazine compounds of formula (I), compositions, and uses thereof. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

18. Claims 11,13,15,17,19,25,27,29,37,39,41,43,45,47,49,51,59,61 and 63 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim

and any intervening claims. The specific salts of claim 11 are not taught or made obvious in the prior art.

Conclusion

19. Please direct any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner to Thomas C McKenzie, Ph. D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-9806. The FAX number for before final amendments is (703) 872-9306. The Examiner is available from 8:30 to 5:30, Monday through Friday. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, you can reach the Examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah at (703) 308-4716. Please direct general inquiries or any inquiry relating to the status of this application to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Thomas McKenzie, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1624

TCMcK
February 6, 2003